



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/037,827

01/03/2002

Dean A. Seifert

26466-0045

6573

29052

7590

04/15/2009

SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP  
999 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E.  
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER

BORLINGHAUS, JASON M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3693

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/15/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/037,827	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SEIFERT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JASON M. BORLINGHAUS	<b>Art Unit</b> 3693	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JASON M. BORLINGHAUS. (3) SCOTT PAINTIN; DIANNA LYONS.

(2) JAMES KRAMER (SPE). (4) CHRIS TONELLI; MALVERN GRIFFIN.

Date of Interview: 01 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Risafi (US Patent 6,473,500) and Marcous (US Patent 5,650,604).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: All parties discussed claim terminology (ie. transaction identifying information and confirmation code) and Examiner's mapping of prior art to said claim terminology. Applicant attempted to differentiate the claimed invention from the asserted prior art and proposed amended claim language to capture this differentiation..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jason M Borlinghaus/ Examiner, Art Unit 3693	
--	--